R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 012 831 95 AA 000 191

STUDENT DRAMATIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAM, EVALUATION REPORT. (TITLE SUPPLIED).

BY- NEILL, ROBERT AND OTHERS
LOUISVILLE BOARD OF EDUCATION, KY.

REPORT NUMBER 67-0412-1 PUB DATE 66
GRANT OEG-2-6-000412-0391
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.80 45P.

DESCRIPTORS- *DRAMATICS, HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS, *ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, *INSTRUCTIONAL TRIPS, CULTURAL ENRICHMENT, *CULTURAL AWARENESS, *HUMANITIES INSTRUCTION,

THE PROGRAM WAS ORGANIZED TO INTEGRATE DRAMATIC ARTS EXPERIENCES WITH THE REGULAR CURRICULUMS AS A MEANS OF HEIGHTENING THE CULTURAL AWARENESS OF STUDENTS AND OF MAKING THEM MORE PERCEPTIVE AND CRITICAL VIEWERS. THIS REPORT PREPARED BY AN EVALUATION COMMITTEE DESCRIBES (1) THE PROGRAM GOALS AND CONCEPTS, ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS, AND DIFFICULTIES WITH TICKET DISTRIBUTION THAT PREVENTED ADEQUATE PREPLANNING AND CLASS PREPARATION BY TEACHERS, (2) THE VALUES AND DEFECTS OF STUDY GUIDES THAT WERE PREPARED, (3) THE METHODS USED TO COMPARE THE RESULTS ACHIEVED BY THE SIX STUDENT GROUPS THAT REPRESENTED DIFFERENT ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS AND LEVELS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE DRAMA PROGRAM, AND (4) AN EVALUATION OF THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PROGRAM AND SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS THAT COULD MAKE FUTURE PROGRAMS BE MORE EFFICIENTLY CONDUCTED AND PROVIDE GREATER OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENT LEARNING. THE COMMITTEE CONCLUDED THAT (1) THERE WAS A LACK OF GENERAL AGREEMENT AMONG ADMINISTRATORS, TEACHERS, AND ACTORS ABOUT THE PHILOSOPHY BEHIND THE VENTURE, (2) ALTHOUGH THE PROGRAM WAS OF VALUE, IT WAS OF VARYING WORTH TO VARIOUS TEACHERS AND THEIR STUDENTS, AND (3) EVIDENCE GATHERED SUPPORTS THE BELIEF THAT THE PROGRAM GENERATED AESTHETIC AND INTELLECTUAL ENTHUSIASM IN SOME AREAS WHERE IT HAD NOT PREVIOUSLY EXISTED. (AL)

ED012831

Evaluation Report
1965-1966 HEW Program

67-04126

Student Dramatic Enrichment Program

OEG 2-6-000412-0391

Louisville Board of Education
506 W. Hill Street
Louisville, Kentucky 40208

Table of Contents

Overview

I. Program Goals and Concepts

II. Administration and Ticket Distribution;
Study Guides as Bridges between Theater and Classroom

III. The Program's Intended Impact;
Actor's Theater as a Professional Company

IV. Evaluation: Needs and Accomplishments

V. Review of Recommendations

Appendix

AA0001191

Overview

Early in 1966, announcement was made of a federal grant to public and private, non-profit secondary schools of Region Three (including schools in Louisville and in the counties of Jefferson, Bullitt, and Oldham) for the enrichment of secondary students' education through integration of dramatic arts experiences with the regular curricula. The application for federal funds, obtained through the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, was premised on the fact that the program utilizes available personnel , both educational and theatrical. Funds would permit duplication of Study Guides of plays to be seen and would permit purchase of tickets to Actor's Theater productions for distribution to students. The Louisville Board of Education was to serve as administrative focal point for the program, and the personnel of Actor's Theater, Louisville's resident professional acting company, would assist in preparation of Study Guides and in other educational aspects of the program. In general, however, Actor's Theater's role in the program was to provide the physical place, the production and direction of professional theater, which would be staged for groups of high school students in addition to the Theater's regular runs of its shows. In addition to the plays already billed for the latter part of 1966, the Theater produced Our Town, a work included in the curriculum and especially useful for its educative content.

The local evaluating team, comprised of three members of the faculty of the University of Louisville's College of Arts and Sciences, met fairly early in 1966 with representatives of the Actor's Theater Board of Directors and the Theater company. Through one of its members, Dr. Robert Neill, the Committee established contact with the administration of the Dramatic Enrichment Program, and, attempting to coordinate its program with the school systems and simultaneously attempting to gear its activities to the stipulations of the application for federal funds, the evaluating committee began its work.

A word is in order about the nature of the evaluating team: although all members are competent in their respective areas, the team cannot be termed a body "of experts in the behavioural sciences," as the applications for funds indicated the testing group would be. Dr. Neill, Assistant-Professor of Education, comes closest to being an "expert in behavioural sciences" of the three, and his interests are more nearly educative than purely scientific. The other two members of the team include Mrs. Marilyn Rieser, who is a professional actress and instructor of speech, and Dr. Leon V. Driskell, specialist in English literature. To a limited extent only could Mrs. Rieser and Dr. Driskell claim disinterested objectivity in evaluation of a dramatics program, for both have been involved in stimulation of University of Louisville interest in drama through serving as discussion leaders for student groups and delivery of lectures on the topics of theater and dramatic literature.

The Committee nevertheless feels that its deliberations have been imparital in that it has been totally free of community and theater interference in its techniques and judgments. If the Committee were to make any complaint in this area, it would be that closer realtions between evaluating team, program administration, and actors would enable some flaws, of merely mechanical nature, to be corrected early in the season. In fact, one recommendation for future programs in Region III stipulates that communication lines between public (including teachers and students) and school administrators and Actor's Theater be improved and perhaps systematized: open discussions of difficulties to which interested teachers would be invited could vitalize the concept of the program as well as serve the purpose of preventive maintenance.

A chief difficulty of the 1966 Dramatic Enrichment Program in Region III stemmed from the fact that all phases of the program, from public relations to criteria of evaluation, had to be regularized in in a short period of time. Consequently, plans for distribution of tickets had to be made by the several boards

of education and proper directives issued without full awareness of the needs of the Evaluating Committee. The rather elaborate and certainly scientific establishment of control groups envisioned by the Evaluating Committee in an initial statement of procedure had to be largely abandoned in the face of administrative difficulties. The Evaluating Committee approved in principle the statement which appears in Appendix A of this report, and it expressed its needs for control groups at an early meeting with representatives of Actor's Theater. In part, Appendix A reads as follows:

> The Committee insists, however, that its evaluative program must begin with no bias, no predispositions to approve the results of the proposed experiment. Assuming that repeated attendance at plays makes for more perceptive and critical viewers would be to assume a value that has not yet been established. Consequently, the committee seeks to test a control group--comprised of equal numbers of males and females and equally representing urban, suburban, and rural communities--on its responses to four productions. Given discriminating tests, comparative analysis of results of four sets of scores should indicate the educative value of repeated attendance at plays. Meanwhile, scores of control-group students may be compared with scores of other students.
>
> Distribution of tickets is of great importance to the evaluation aspect of the project. Assuming expenditure of 145 tickets for each production to members of a control group, the committee must yet ask further control of distribution. If tickets are given to students who ask for them, the testing results will reflect aptitudes of students already inclined to attend plays. The ideal situation would be for entire classes to attend performances together; in some cases, especially those in which whole classes are judged either superior or inferior in performance and aptitude, both (types) should attend.

The Evaluating Committee was unable to achieve the supposedly ideal distribution of tickets it initially sought, and since the beginning of the program, the committee recognizes deficiencies in its ideal. Equal numbers of urban, suburban, and rural students, for instance, would represent an imbalance in terms of Region Three location of students. Distributional standards are more fully discussed in SectionII, "Administration and Ticket Distribution." In that part of the report, the Evaluating Committee attempts to consider its needs in terms of overall cultural and educative value of the program.

Confronted with a ticket-distribution sharply different from its preconceived ideal, the Evaluating Committee was obliged to alter some of its techniques: the chief shift of emphasis was from an absolute judgment of the program's value as such to an appraisal of the organization and implementation of the program. Hence, Administration has been examined, in part, as it relates to community awareness of the program and the program's role in education. Hence, one item under "Administration" includes an appraisal through educator's eyes of the Study Guides and the extent of the Guides usefulness in the program: through judgment of the attractiveness and usefulness of the guides and through some assessment of the extent to which classroom teachers actually used the Guides as a means of heightening theater awareness, the committee hopes to establish some of the areas of accomplishment through administrative channels. It also hopes to underscore a partial failure to prepare teachers for use of materials and theater attendance to their maximum. Techniques of appraisal of the Guides are largely academic and professional; techniques of appraisal of teacher-utilization of Guides are largely subjective: this is to say simply that teacher response to the Guides and their statements of usefulness have been weighted heavily. To a limited extent, two members of the Evaluative Committee have sought student response to the Guides and the classroom use

All of the items in the Evaluating Committee's report are obviously closely linked: effectiveness of program and its impact depend heavily upon administration

and community (including teacher and student) enthusiasm for the concepts involved. Clearly, the material under the heading "The Program's Impact" is limited by ticket distribution facts; furthermore, that material reveals facts about the plays chosen, the theatrical group involved, the classroom approach to the plays, and the skill of test-makers, interviewers, and discussion leaders.

The program's impact begins with an assesment of the plays selected. That assessment is on basis of cultural values and suitability for high school viewers. (The Evaluating Committee has reported, for instance, those cases in which students objected to "bad language," but it has not been so blind as to assume that a student complaint represents "unsuitability." This judgment must be made chiefly on the basis of theatrical and professional responsibility, for the committee frankly sees no value in presenting free tickets to plays which are uniformly unobjectional to a cross-section of the community. So bland a fare would represent pandering to public habits, not establishing a means of heightening cultural awareness.)

Dr. Driskell and Mrs. Rieser have attempted a statement of evaluation of the quality of theater experience to which students have been exposed. Perhaps this area could have been omitted from consideration, admitting that even professional persons are possessors of personal taste; nevertheless, it was judged that, in addition to student responses on objective and subjective tests and in group discussions, the evaluators should express aesthetic opinions on the quality of theater involved.

The section dealing with "Evaluation Needs and Accomplishments" is one of the most important in the Evaluating Committee's report, for here the Committee affirms need for more conscious assimilation of evaluative needs into the concept of the program, as it touches ticket distribution and integration of drama into the classrooms in a maximumly effectly manner: in particular, the committee emphasizes the need for involvement of classroom teachers in ways that would make drama, as presented in live form, clearly superior or inferior to drama <u>as taught in traditional ways.</u> Greater participation by teachers in drafting the program's concept and in presenting that concept to students would destroy local misaprehensions that attendance at Actor's Theater free of charge is the special priviledge of the under-priviledged. In short, the program could be clarified as chiefly educational and cultural, rather than a means of righting social, economic inequities.

In particular, however, although the Evaluating Committee became keenly aware of difficulties arising from blurred concepts of the program's intentions, both on the part of students and teachers to say nothing of the typical citizen, Section IV recommends the pursuit of a research project, perhaps foundation-supported, which would lead to a behaviourly-based estimation of the cultural impact of the "Dramatic Enrichment Program" in Region III. The Committee's recommendations, under this head, include the relationship of a chief evaluator to the administrative structure of the educational system in order that he have access to all stages of the planning and implementation of the program. Furthermore, it is recommended that, for a first year at any rate, the chief evaluator be a social scientist of regional, if not national, repute, whose findings might be published for professional study at national level of distribution. Clearly, such an evaluator and his staff must not be part-time specialists, although it might be possible for the operations of such a group to be integrated with graduate instruction at some local institution, thus further disseminating skills and data.

Finally, before presenting the detailed report under its four main headings, the ommittee must make a final statement of principle and belief.

Evaluation of the half-year program just ended must be stated in positive and favorable terms, regardless of difficulties and dissatisfaction with particular aspects of the experiment. In part at least, this committee judges that the educative and cultural values sought were attained; nevertheless, the committee is unprepared to declare uniquivocally that those values may be demonstrated to

to have effected any major change in individual, or group, and certainly not in community attitudes. Rather, the committee affirms that its evidence supports belief that the program generated aesthetic and intellectual enthusiasm in some areas where it had not previously existed. Any group of teachers will judge this accomplishment great.

The extent of community value to be achieved from a broad-base theater orientation in secondary schools is to be determined only through application of bias. In the days of consciousness of two distinct, mutually uncommunicative cultures, many educators insist, almost hysterically, upon the rounding of educational experience to include both humanities and sciences. Other educators, perhaps equally hysterical about technological or humanistic values, lose sight of the need for balance. The fact remains, however, that the preconceived attitude of the agencies responsible for the recent program is that DRAMA IS A PART OF THE CHILD'S BIRTHRIGHT. A further fact remains that the teaching of literary appreciation, and aesthetic awareness generally, has lagged behind other, factually-based or pragmatically useful disciplines.

The Evaluating Committee makes no apology for its acceptance of the assumption that, properly implemented, the integration of live-dramatic experience in the secondary curriculum amounts to an educative step forward. Whether this educational value will result in securing long-lasting cultural values in a community no less addicted to the easy pleasures of mass-produced entertainment, no committee can judge.

Finally, in cursory form, the committee affirms that enrichment of language-literature experience in the public schools is greatly needed in Region Three as in most areas of Kentucky; that provision of added opportunity for Actor's Theater to reach its potential patrons at high school age and to perform its shows a maximum number of times with financial advantage is in itself a cultural boon to the state; and that extension of free theater tickets to whole classes not only overcomes invidious socio-economic distinctions and provides theater experience to students who might be deprived of its for reasons other than financial, but also generates the kind of dynamic learning situation likely to demand the best of our teachers.

I

Program Goals and Concepts

The specific aims of the participants in the Dramatic Enrichment Program were spelled out in the proposal which resulted in financial support being given the project by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Those aims were posited on the assumption that dramatic arts experience is a part of every child's cultural heritage; simultaneously, however, the school administrators who drafted the proposal recognized that children from affluent environments as well as those from deprived environments may be denied their participation in theater. This denial, the index to which is not the annual income, stems in part from the fact that Americans continue to nurture a latent anti-intellectualism; the nature of twentieth-century society, with its mass and popular radio and television entertainment, prompts many supposedly "educated" men and women to assume that the live theater is the peculiar province of the intellectual elite--whom they are rather prone to scorn as "impractical and visionary."

One difficulty is, of course, that young people in America traditionally learn their drama at the schoolteacher's knee. Only rarely are they able to see the written--and frequently, to their way of thinking--dull word transposed to living meaning on the professional stage. What plays they have seen were limping, overly-ambitious productions of Shakespeare, the mysteries of which inspire awe in actors and viewers by their very supposed difficulties. Drama may suffer in the classroom because teachers are no more initiated than their students: the suggestion is not that teachers are inadequately trained in the classroom; rather, in many cases, they too, are culturally deprived in that their experience in drama has been limited to books, not extended to the theater.

The Dramatics Enrichment Program operates under the as-yet-unproved assumption that attendance at plays is capable of producing positive cultural values. These values, wisely, we seek through <u>integration of dramatic experience with classroom experience</u>. Rather than release students from academic requirements and send them promiscuously to the theater, the participating agencies seek to combine attendance

at a professionally produced play with the usual literary and socio-historical study of the play's author and text. In this way, students know what they see and take to the production some of the sophistication professional troups rightfully expect of their audiences. Among the interesting areas of advancement open to student (and perhaps teacher) participants in the program is the breaking down of erroneous, misinformed attitudes toward theaters and theatrical people. Although admitting in its popular sense the adage that "The show's the thing," that is, that theatrical productions must "play well," participants in an integrated program of viewing and studying get the sense of directorial blending of theatrical and literary elements: they finally recognize that the play has relevance for its viewers, and the director's and actors' tasks are to make immediate and forceful the meanings implicit in the work. (In this respect, the Study Guides distributed by the program administrators last season did good service, providing a comment about each production expressive of the director's aims and aspirations.)

To the extent that the program's goals and concepts embrace the integration of dramatic experience and classroom experience, the evaluating committee must express wholehearted approval; techniques of achieving this blend for the establishment of a more nearly literate and perspicuous young population require careful examination in later sections of this report. The Committee, aware that approval has already been granted for a second year of Dramatic Enrichment under Federal support, recommends that the local administration of the program reaffirm its belief in the principle of integrated theater-classroom experience and pursue all reasonable means toward bringing dramatic experience and classroom experience more closely together. Specifically, the committee recommends expenditure of effort and funds, if possible, to assure that every teacher whose students see Actor's Theater productions be encouraged to see the work also. Furthermore, the committee recommends that tape recordings of parts of plays and discussions of interpretive questions (perhaps involving director and actor, or director and classroom teacher) be made available for classroom use. (At one University of Louisville discussion of an Actor's Theater play, it became obvious that actors share student disagreement with the

direction of the show under discussion; actors were candid, but quite properly defended their director's rights to interpret the play as he had read it. At other discussions, faculty discussion leaders admitted disagreement with one another about basic meanings of a play: far from lessening the play's educative values, this disagreement opened wide the opportunities for students to question and to discover meaning. The latter play was Sartre's No Exit.)

The above parenthetical observation leads to some specific comments on the meaning and function of education itself.

For some people the primary objective of education is embodied in preserving and perpetuating a social order. To others the individual in the social order becomes the target for the aims and objectives of education which seek to provide him with opportunities for development of his capacities. It seems that both objectives are served when schools seek to develop moral beings with purposes and loyalties valuable to themselves and to the society in which they live.

To that end the Dramatic Enrichment Program has sought to develop the individual potentialities by offering high school students unique participation in live-theater and lay presentation of some means of developing critical views of our society and cultural heritage. Specifically, the Program holds these objectives common to those held by educators and the school systems those educators serve:

1) Training for worthy use of leisure time by affording participation with other students and adults in one culturally-based, community activity;

2) Training for the command of fundamental processes in the development and use of language, which in turn promotes healthy, vigorous, and satisfying home and community life;

(In the above respect, one must observe the extent to which recent American literature has dramatized, no matter in what form the artist has worked, the breakdown of language with its concommitant breakdown of human understanding and compassion. Some of the world's best thinkers have broached the question of what happens when citizens abdicate their responsibilities in analysis of and criticism of language--

in the arts as well as in the daily press, on T.V., and in government directive.)

3) Training in citizenship through opportunities for participation with others in communication of thought to others and reception of ideas, first, in literary form, then in dramatic form, and finally, in group discussions permitting exchange of ideas and beliefs;

4) Training in evaluating good and desirable aesthetic impulses which promotes broader development of individuals;

5) Training in understanding of an appreciation for the civilization in which the learner lives and in the acquisition of skills necessary in getting along in that world;

6) Training in the process of extrapolation of meanings and values from one time and society to another time and society.

(Moliere's School for Wives provides a case in point: students were not misled by gorgeous costumes and extravagant, even precious, gesturings of the characters; they recognized the timeliness of the play, even as they laughed at the episodes.)

Hence, the Dramatic Enrichment Program seeks to go beyond the idea that the theater exists solely as a means of entertaining the individual. Rather, the Program sees the experiences offered students as adjuncts to an extensions of the general school curriculum by affording broader and richer experiences in literature (drama) and the performing arts. Thus, the living theater becomes purposeful in providing ways to satisfy individual needs as well as in providing ways to develop societal needs and aims.

Contrary to Ulich, who wrote in his Conditions of Civilized Living,

> No country, so far, has been able to reconcile the two goals of modern education, that is, to supply on the one hand some degree of cultural unity within the nation and, on the other hand, the full development of individual talent. Nor has any country solved the dilemma which stems from the two-fold obligation of education: namely, to serve specific interests such as preparation for a vocation and for loyal citizenship within an individual nation and to represent the universal values of humanity as a whole.

The Program seeks to blend both sets of objectives of modern education: individual

growth and development and deeper student understanding of social obligation called for by membership in a democratic community, which membership now begs for young citizens to understand and appreciate human value and dignity no matter what the circumstances of birth and no matter what the circumstances of national and ethical origins of others in his experience.

The American-British poet Thomas Stearne Eliot and the Spanish poet-playwright Ortega y Gasset have affirmed in recent years the necessity of class distinctions as among the prerequisites for the construction of a great culture. The Dramatic Enrichment Program, far from positing such necessities, has sought to broaden perspectives among members of all social and economic classes, recognizing that twentieth-century mechanistic civilization has as great power to subvert from human values the upper-middle class youngster as the lowerclass one. One of the Dramatic Enrichment Program's chief faults, from the evaluative point of view, emerges as a virtue if seen in this context: ticket distribution has been limited to no sub-structure of the eligible students. Opportunities have been afforded on egalitarian bases, thus admitting the premise that social and cultural responsibility is broadly and deeply disseminated in this country and, specifically, in Region III, from which student participants in the program are drawn.

The Evaluating Committee, while seeking means of measuring more exactly the program's effect on individuals and segments of society, commends the participating agencies for their realistic and democratic awareness of the nature of twentieth-century America. It recommends, in this connection, that public relations be improved to make a positive value of distribution of tickets to students from both advantaged and disadvantaged homes: negligible, but unnecessary, have been the occasional criticisms of the program for affording free tickets to youngsters whose families could afford the advantage of theater and other cultural benefits for their children.

II

Administration and Ticket Distribution

Note: Assessment of administration of the Dramatic Enrichment Program leads the Committee to observe lack of general agreement among administrators, teachers, and actors about the philosophy behind the venture. Such a common philosophy, we suggest, would permit assessment of the program on the basis of its success in achieving specific objectives. Since remarks on Administration were written independently of the section on "Program Goals and Concepts," the committee has chosen to leave the duplication of emphasis in the report; it underlines the Committee's awareness that, though the program is of value, it is of varying worth to various teachers and their students.

Assessment of Administration and Ticket Distribution in the 1965-66 Dramatic Enrichment Program in Region Three must begin with its focus upon the vital question of ticket distribution, for it is in this area that the Evaluating Committee finds evidence of mixed attitudes toward the project and it is on this issue that the program's ultimate failure or success will depend. The following table indicates distribution of tickets to the five performances of Actor's Theater productions:

Table I

Distribution of Tickets Among School Systems in Region III

Play Production	City	County	Parochial* (Others)	Total
A Doll's House	150**	130	221**	501
School for Wives	403	174	723	1300
Death of a Salesman	558	836	406	1800
The Tavern	558	669	573	1800
Our Town	1240	1846	914	4000
Total	2809**	3655	2837	9401

* Parochial and Others includes parochial schools in the Louisville Archdiocese, Anchorage Public Schools, Oldham, and Bullett Public Schools.

** Incomplete records at the Program's beginning prevent clear pictures of distribution to Ibsen's A Doll's House. Entries are careful estimates.

A second table permits dramatization of the equity of ticket distribution:

Table II

Ticket Distribution

City	County	Parochial (Others)
30%	38%	31%

Observing the increase of ticket-distribution for the several plays is also instructive; after a slow beginning, ticket distribution soared from 501 to 1300. It then stabilized at 1800 for two shows, before soaring again, this time to 4,000, for the post-season production of Our Town.

Distribution of Tickets

Records of ticket distribution indicate several problems, most of which stem from the fact that administrators were "rushed" into hastily organizing the mechanical details of the program. Tickets arrived late at the main distribution points, i.e. at the various boards of education. Further delay due to breakdown of a system's allotment and the distribution among the school to its participating teachers created additional anxieties among teachers. The Louisville Public Schools solved part of the problem by having the printers leave that system's portion at its headquarters as the printers delivered the total order for each play to Actor's Theater. However, the Jefferson County System, of necessity, had to wait until Actor's Theater distributed the proper portion of tickets to the County Headquarters on Newburg Road. Consequently, some schools had tickets available for student distribution as late as the morning of a scheduled production. Such distribution schedules did not give teachers the necessary time to arrange for transportation except in a most perfunctory manner. Thus, often, only students who had immediate access to automobiles attended. Many times the delays prevented students from obtaining necessary parental permission even though transportation was available. The Committee notes that teachers used only a

very small portion of the funds allocated for providing transportation.

Understandable though the situation may be under the "hurried" arrangements and the need to "get the project off the ground," the Committee feels that both Actor's Theater and the participating school systems need to come to some more expeditious plan for the distribution of tickets. The solution lies somewhere close to that found by the Louisville Public Schools, i.e. direct supply from the printing firm to the several boards of education or, as in the case of some private schools, direct shipment to responsible persons within the schools. The Committee feels that teachers and students deserve the courtesy of having more time to plan and to make appropriate arrangements.

The Committee detected two interpretations of "democratic" distribution of tickets. One interpretation relates to distribution among pupils in schools; the other embodies distribution among teachers in schools. The effects of the two interpretations are different as in the case of "pupils in schools" no cohesive and uniform program of discussion and instruction in classrooms is possible. Teachers find that only a handful of pupils get to attend; and to coordinate her literature program with a production becomes less meaningful to those pupils who do not attend. Attendance, instruction, and follow-ups under this interpretation of democratic distribution supports a <u>laisse faire</u> approach.

On the other hand, an interpretation which encompasses the distribution of tickets among teachers allows attendance by classrooms of students. Teachers can then, only if they have sufficient notice and an adequate supply of guides, aim toward a better planned and more highly controlled learning experience. Such interpretation permits several advantages which the Committee sees.

1) A discussion of and depth study in play production, staging and management;

2) a sound reading and depth study of the play and its author which includes appreciation of time, social condition, and literary merit;

3) an understanding of peripheral values as a) how to participate as a part of an audience, b) the adjunct vocational employment in the theater setting, c) the expected role of young adults among matinee and serious theater goers.

All of these support the expected and hoped for outcomes which supplement the intellectual stimulation and cultural enrichment already noted.

Administration

The outset of the Actor's Theater venture was, at first, "harried," "rushed," and "worried." Never-the-less, the accomplishments of dedicated people are not small nor unnoticed, and this venture must be marked as "successful."

First of all, the proposal was quickly drawn up which meant that many of the details which insure smooth operation and a close evaluation were overlooked. Naturally, fears arose about several points which need mentioning.

1. A fear which was uppermost in the minds of administrators was that the proposal might detract from allocation of funds which were sorely needed in other areas of the general curriculum.

2. A fear that the content of the plays might find outspoken objections from the patrons, parents, and pupils because of either the subject matter dealt with in a play or the often employed "street" language used in the dialogues.

3. A fear that the quality of each performance would be less than "professional," since Actor's Theater was relatively "new to the game."

Happily, all three fears were not necessary. In so far as the Committee has been able to ascertain no program which received federal funding was reduced, no complaints were lodged about the content and/or language (however, the Committee suspects that the Company did alter some language usage in the dialogues but no motive of "condescention" was uncovered), and the productions were favorably received and marked as "Adequate." A section appears in the report which scrutinizes the productions against a backdrop of professional standards and criteria.

Two issues arise from the evaluation of the administration with respect to the purposes of such ventures. The discussion of the issues deserve the time and attention of both educators and members of the theater.

1) what role in a secondary school curriculum does the living theater have? Is the role one which embodies such notions as "correlate" and/or "enrichment?" We feel that it needs pointing out that some view these experiences as extentions of the classroom and the subject matter taught at school; others feel that these experiences afford opportunities to see and to do something which time in school doesn't permit.

2) what role does the living theater play in society and how do we educate the public (students included) to the expected functioning? If the role is one of "entertainment," it seems as if there are less costly and more appropriate avenues. The Committee does not deny that the living theater serves a function of "entertainment;" however, we must point out that there is a broader responsibility, purpose, and function which the theater must meet. That is, simply, to make social comment on the problems and issues we face because we need to seek solutions to those problems and issues.

All of this is to say that the Committee found no general agreement in philosophy behind the venture among the administrators, the teachers, and professional members of Actor's Theater who formulated the proposal. A common philosophy would allow the formulation of specific aims and objectives against which the venture could be assessed. Perhaps this accounts for some of the variance in distribution of tickets to pupils and teachers, the lack of knowledge about and a feeling of little participation in the venture shared by both teachers and principals, and the feeling of encroachment upon school time and curriculum expressed by others.

Confronted with logistical problems after writing, edition, and producing Study Guides, the project committee responsible for the Study Guides understandably felt that its efforts were inadequately rewarded in terms of teacher--and student use. The awareness of last year's problems and the slightly greater amount of time for doing its work will doubtless enable the Study Guide committee to get its product to teachers in better time for maximum usefulness. The section of the report, entitled "The Program's Impact," makes specific recommendations about Study Guides.

In addition to the distribution of Study Guides, a topic considered elsewhere, the Committee feels that administrators responsible for the program ought to see that school libraries have at least two copies of each play available for teacher use and several copies of the plays available for pupil use. Toward this end, all people contacted agree with the Committee.

The Committee was mindful of the problem which "curtain" time presents. For outlying schools to reach the theater in the least amount of time calls for some consideration of the hazzards involved. Road safety and traffic jams can not be ignored. If either students furnish their own transportation or school buses transport

children, the Committee wonders if allowing for only twenty minutes between school dismissal and matinee "curtain" time does not encourage unsafe driving practices. Actor's Theater personnel should carefully consider any professional objections (union rules and requirements included)to a delay in "curtain time" and adjust evening performances accordingly. If both actors, the theater, and educators see this venture as a necessary condition for cultural development and enrichment among its citizens, then the entente is greatly enhanced by some compromise to insure the maximum safety for students.

With respect to some contentions that Actor's Theater consider two separate series (even if some overlap occurs) for students and public, the Committee strongly suggests that the matter be delayed or shelved. Primarily, we see pressing needs for the aculturation of students from certain segments of the population into the adult world. That students sit side by side with public patrons affords the maximum exposure to many ways of achieving desirable objectives in audience participation, vocational and cultural values attainment, and models among adults necessary for full appreciation of and development in drama.

A final consideration must be given to the distribution of tickets to school personnel whose influence bears directly upon this project. The objective here, is not altruistic in its nature. Rather, the objective is to gain the honest support of those supervisors and administrators directly involved with the success of the project. While we were not shocked to find great numbers of students who had never attended a theatrical performance before, read drama other than that required in the curriculum, or had exposure save through viewing high school presentations, we were totally unprepared to discover so many among the teaching and administrative ranks who had so little experience in viewing live theater.

The Committee felt that boards of education are to be commended upon the support they give for dramatics classes in some of the secondary schools. We were encouraged to find small pockets of ardent, lively, active teacher support in four of the schools (Ahrens, Seneca, Trinity, and Sacred Heart Academy). We were assured

that these do not comprise the total list of those schools which found reason to support Actor's Theater long before the project was proposed.

Study Guides as Bridges Between Theater and Classroom

A committee of teachers, administrators, and representatives of Actor's Theater produced Study Guides last year for each of the plays to be seen by Region Three high school students. These guides, handsomely produced and thoughtfully organized, might have served better as bridges between theater and classroom had teachers known far enough in advance that their students would have tickets to see particular plays and if distribution of Guides had been more efficiently expedited. This is not to say that the Guides lacked impact; rather, it is to say that they did not accomplish optimum impact under last season's system of distribution of tickets and Guides.

In some instances, the Guides themselves are open to criticism in use of language, slight distortions of fact, and assumption of teacher knowledge beyond what appears justifiable. To specify, briefly, on each of these criticisms, the Committee singles out the Study Guide on Moliere's School for Wives. Admitting the haste with which Guides had to be produced, one must yet deplore the fact that some sentences in that Study Guide fail fully to accomplish their purposes. The Committee has marked the first page of that Guide to indicate the nature of its complaints; those complaints lead to the following recommendation:

> The Committee recommends that the Study Guide Committe for 1966-67 make all possible efforts to assure that the Guides are unexceptionable in points of grammar and syntax and that some vital critical points in the individual plays be treated specifically enough that the teacher unfamiliar with a particular epoch of drama or a particular dramatist's work be guided into consideration of major issues.

The above criticism and accompanying recommendation are not so sweeping as they may appear at first glance; only rarely do the Guides fail to maintain a high and professional level of competence. Nevertheless, the Committee feels its responsibilities to observe failures as it lauds accomplishments.

One particularly important part of the Guides' funtion should be the listing of a few articles, drawn from popular periodicals, easily obtained, or from other reference works, to enable teachers who wish to do so to assign some further reading and reporting on issues at stake in the plays. Such items as the encyclopedia

should be included only when the article there is of uncommon value, for most students have recourse to the encyclopedia without guidance there.

Of particular value was the Department in the Guides called "From the Director's Notebook," for it provided a whiff of greasepaint in that the director's concern was always both literary and theatrical: the production problems and the language of the theater doubtless operated in such a way as to permit students, frequently for the first time, to comprehend the director's role in interpreting plays and in giving the written word life on the stage.

Also of great value in all study Guides for 1965-66 were the discussion questions, divided into groups for use before and after the viewing. The committee gives all but unqualified approval to those questions, although, in some instances, it feels that teachers should have been given a little more help. An instance may serve to make the point: Richard Block, producer-director of Actor's Theater, has lately admitted to me that he knew little of the Classic French Theater until fairly recently in his career. If this be the case with a man whose career is theater and who is imminently qualified for that career, it should doubtles be assumed that teachers of humanities, drama, and English may suffer under the same disability. Certainly, failure to know a particular play by a particular playwright does not indicate incompetence. Nevertheless, the Moliere Study Guide asks the following question:

> Did you think of the characters as real people or merely as figments of the playwrigth's mind? How did you relate to these persons: Arnolphe? the young girl? the young lover? the servants?

Since students are in the habit of identifying with characters in literature, many students doubtless wished to affirm the "reality" of characters in <u>School for Wives</u>; similarly, teachers may have thought that identification was demanded. This issue is basic to the play, for the playwright's "distance" depends upon the viewers recognizing human traits in the characters but realizing that they are not, for the most part, to be taken seriously. At the end of the play, Arnolphe has lost his great dream. Actor's Theater made clear that this loss was cause for humor, not pity of a very deep variety. Perhaps the question in point might have been slanted somewhat to

read, "In what specific ways does Moliere influence the viewer not to identify too deeply with his characters? Does your inability to pity Arnolphe at the end of the play, or the lovers during the main action, lessen the play's impact or increase it? Why?" Such a question would have led students to particular features of the play's staging; meantime the teacher would have known a bit more clearly where the discussion might most profitably lead.

By way of summation, the committee affirms the positive value of the Study Guides as produced but suggests that a second Season should provide opportunity for the production committee to vitalize the Guides as teacher and student aids to appreciation of what happens to the written word when it is transposed to the stage as action and speech. As logical corrolary to this goal, it recommends increased communication with classroom teachers to obtain necessary insights to their needs and desires for teaching aids. The usefulness of Guides, and indeed, of the entire theater experience rests finally in classroom teachers' hands, and their commitment to the program transfers directly to students.

The Evaluating Committee has conducted a series of telephone interviews with classroom teachers, seeking to discover their response to the Guides and to the distribution of Guides. In 1966-67, the Evaluating Committee recommends that forms for teacher-criticism be attached to teacher copies of the Guide; the forms should be accompanied by envelopes to pass to program coordinators or principals. (Envelopes will assure that the teachers' unsigned comments will be perfectly confidential, for the Evaluating Committee will make no effort to determine which school makes particular criticisms.) In addition to a few specific questions about the individual Guide, the criticism forms should provide ample space for teacher comments and requests.

Telephone interviews with teachers about the 1966 guides revealed a pervasive gratitude for them and several levels of dependence upon them. Frequently the distribution of tickets to only a small portion of the class prevented total class participation in discussion. Sometime the guides, distributed to ticket-holders or "interrested" students who might purchase their own tickets were the only opportunity the

students had for enlarging upon their experience. In other cases the teachers permitted limited class discussion or encouraged individuals to talk over the play with them privately. One teacher, who accompanied students in a school bus, said that the discussion sparked by the guide made the return trip "stimulating and exciting." The guides were more widely used if the plays were included in textbooks or if the entire class were able to attend the performance. One teacher, given tickets to Death of a Salesman for only half of her class, ingeniously required the balance to see the television version so that she could use the guides with the total class. Most teachers were enthusiastic about the guides, particularly about the discussion questions. There was a marked preference for the guide on Death of a Salesman. The unfavorable criticism of the Guides was contributed by teachers who were also theatrically sophisticated. Even in these instances, however, most criticism was directed toward the earlier issues. Only one or two teachers complained of inadequate distribution.

III
The Program's Intended Impact

The impact of the integrated dramatic and classroom experiences necessarily depended in part on effectiveness of administration and effectiveness of classroom teachers in preparing students for the experience and following up the experience in such a way as to keep vivid the living qualities of theater. It is, of course, possible to talk any work of art to death--to insist upon its meaning, and its cultural value to the point that the healthy high schooler will wish that he had never heard of the work. There is always the danger of self-consciousness on the part of teacher and student--a kind of hushed awe in the face of capital-A Art.

Though the evaluating team does not feel that it is competent to judge the individual performances of classroom teachers (nor would it wish to presume if it were competent), the committee has collected some data about the extent of emphasis given the plays seen during 1966. In some instances, what appears very slight emphasis may have been ideal for the teacher and the students involved: the teacher who admittedly does not know anything about French theater would do well not to present encyclopaedia-garnered data to her class, but the teacher's lack of specific information does not preclude her sensitive and intelligent presentation of dramatic opportunity to her class. Similarly, the teacher who vaguely disapproves of Death of A Salesman (as many American viewers do) should not be expected to overcome her prejudice on command; in some instances, disapproving teachers may afford students a point of departure for forming their own judgments. In other instances, teachers may send students to a play armed with reasons not to like the work, and both teachers and students may learn something important about drama if the play manages to work its spell despite student predisposition.

One of the Committee's indexes to teacher performance has been a series of telephone calls in which teachers were asked about their responses to and use of the Study Guides afforded them for the five plays seen by high school students. The Committee does not assume the excellence of the Guides; it attempts to look critically at the administrative effectiveness of distributing Guides and encouraging teachers to use them.

Before any other topic may be broached, however, it appears wise to examine the Actor's Theater offerings during the latter half of last season, attempting to determine the suitability of individual plays and the group of plays for classroom teaching and for high school viewing. Then, it will be appropriate to assess the plays as professional productions. Thirdly, it will be useful to examine the Study Guides produced for use in Region Three high schools and remark about their use in the schools.

First of all, the plays produced in Actor's Theater's 1965-66 season were of uniform high quality and were highly suitable for viewing by secondary school students. The plays produced after the first of the year , that is, the plays for which students were given tickets, included Ibsen's A Doll's House, Moliere's School for Wives, Miller's Death of A Salesman, Cohan's The Tavern, and Wilder's Our Town. These playwrights and their works are a part of theater history, and, as such, permit comparisons historically (in terms of techniques) as well as thematically.

The only plays of the five which could possibly be judged "improper" for high school students to see are the Moliere and Miller: both plays contain allusions to adultery. In neither case, however, was the sexual innuendo treated offensively. The Moliere play shows as ridiculous an older man who seeks to keep his innocent young fiancee ignorant of the physical aspects of love; his lact of trust and his unwillingness to risk his heart in the constant danger of human love made him far more ridiculous than did his age. In short, Actor's Theater did not play Moliere in a way calculated to underline the physical deficiency of the older man; similarly, though Horace, the young lover, was appropriately handsome, he was so totally inane that his efforts to seduce were no less absurd than his later efforts to elope with Agnes. Death of A Salesman, on the other hand, is far more likely to offend viewers because of its incisive look at a middleaged failure, Harry Loman, with whom many of us are prone to identify poignantly. (The national organization representing the sales business has already attempted to get Miller to alter Loman's character in order to improve the image of salesmen.) Loman's tragedy does not result from his being a salesman; rather, it results from his inability to be self-critical or honest.

He does not know himself, and because he does not know himself, he rears his sons to believe in an "image" he cannot sustain. Meantime, they have been corrupted and view themselves unrealistically. Like their father, Hap and Biff think that it is their likeable personalities, their dress, and their former athletic prowess which will help them get ahead; they do not recognize the need for a good product, a clear mind, and hard work. Loman's motto has been "a shoeshine and a smile," and the boys are deeply disturbed by the discrepancy between what they believe in and what they discover to be the fact of twentieth-century life. Loman's adultery is of great importance in the play, but it need not--and was not in the Actor's Theater production--be projected in a lascivious way.

Loman is deeply in love with his wife Linda, but, being what he is, he needs constant adulation, even if it be from a whore. At the moment his son Biff needs him most and is searching for him, Loman is in a hotel room with a woman friend to whom he has been giving stockings, although Linda's life is a constant race with the darning needles to keep her stockings and the boys' socks mended. The important elements in the adultery scene are Biff's disillusionment and Loman's sense of guilt. The nightmare quality of the whore's laughter and her total insensitivity to the human drama she witnesses between Biff and his father were apparent in the Louisville production. If Dr. Johnson's morality is to be applied here, Actor's Theater managed to paint vice in a highly unattractive form. Willy's sensitivity, even in error, or in sin, was apparent, and the play underscored his guilt and the role it played in further undermining him as a man.

The moral issues in A Doll's House came through adequately for the viewer acquainted with the play; Norah's "guilt" and its motivation contrasted sharply with Helmer's self-seeking and legalistic morality, permitting students to question the nature of good and evil even as they questioned the meaning of human marriage. The Tavern and Our Town require no justification or comment; both are clearly suitable for high school audiences. The Tavern, as staged, was delightfully funny, and permitted the overflow of student enthusiasms and antipathies with appropriate cheers and boos for the Vagabond and the Villain. Our Town, besides being of

immense importance so far as meaning is concerned, represents so daring a departure from usual stage techniques that it continues to deserve playing for American audiences, which are prone to insist upon conventional techniques.

As a group of plays the offerings were rather heavy on twentieth-century, but period pieces have a limited appeal and the evaluating committee is of the opinion that the balance of shows was effective. Beginning with A Doll's House, students saw a major and controversial work of Ibsen's;doubtless many of their teachers had opportunity to discuss the emergence of realism into nineteenth-century drama. School for Wives and The Tavern, though widely separated in time and place, made similar demands in that their characters have to be played as types. Just as the elegance of manner, the never-never land attitudes, and disarming candor of characters in School for Wives prevented the action from appearing sordid, so the melodramatic flair in The Tavern permitted announcement of wholesale killings without the expected audience reaction. Both these plays remind the viewer that they are plays and not to be taken too seriously; as such, they contrast with Miller's play and Wilder's, for in both those works the audience is apt to become deeply and personally involved.

Like much of Tennesse Williams' work, these plays are essentially memory plays; they require that the viewer respond to very sensitive keying of his visual and auditory mechanism in order to feel the highly subjective meanings they embody. Both plays make great demands on audiences; they are not "pre-digested" as so much of American art is today. Because they leave questions to be resolved and attempt merely to dramatize a part of the human condition, they succeed in realizing for student-viewers the fact that life is no simple sequence of events from joyous youth to idyllic old age. Without being cynical, both plays insist upon individual judgment and responsibility.

Surely, by now, the only play of the five which could be termed "experimental" is Our Town, for Wilder's techniques continue to feel contemporary despite the efforts of the avant garde to outstrip him. It should be observed that a director can render any play experimental, but, fortunately, Actor's Theater, though creative in its use of actors and facilities, contented itself to play good shows, not seeking

the peculiar for its own sake.

The committee's only possible recommendation about the shows produced for student viewing would be that the various agencies cooperating in the Dramatic Enrichment Program make every effort to leave Actor's Theater free in its choice of plays and in its treatment of them, for the professional company has its professional reputation and financial success at stake. If it is guilty of offering a shoddy season, its newspaper notices and boxoffice will exert the proper incentive to renewed excellence. (In this connection, it must be said here that, while Actor's Theater obviously is eager to play matinees for high school audiences, its success does not depend on that source of income.) Local dramatic critics were less than gentle to Actor's Theater last year, criticising the shows relentlessly; this trend, the evaluating committee, believes is healthy, but only if response to criticism is mature. Actor's Theater responded maturely, and, for the most part, so did the community: one must recognize that differences in readings, significant to critic, theatrical people, and to literary scholars, do not necessarily render a play unmeaningful to viewers unacquainted with much of theatrical literature. At no point did critics raise the question of professionalism, nor did they complain of the choices of plays. Quite obviously, the local Theater is professional in every sense of the word, and their choices of vehicles were above reproach.

Actor's Theater as a Professional Company

A definition of "professional" as opposed to "amateur" includes both the fact of paid personnel and the notion of high quality. Actor's Theater of Louisville is certainly "professional" theater on both counts. Indeed, the production level is higher than that of many of the companies that slip into the recently reconstructed Brown Theater, local stage for professional road companies, and certainly higher than most of the amateur and semi-professional offerings by regional groups. Since the Health, Education and Welfare grant, each Actor's Theater production has been conscientiously directed, well-acted and handsomely mounted. Also, the rehearsal period has been satisfactorilly completed by opening night--something we cannot always say for either local amateur offerings or touring professional companies: for example, the actor's lines are secure and their movements clear and positive, the light cues are deftly timed, the sets remain solid and practical throughout performance. Actor's Theater presents to its audiences a "clean show."

As with any company limited for the most part to its resident directing, acting and production staff, some plays are better handled than others. The first play presented to students was Ibsen's A Doll's House. Early in the run the actress playing the central character, Nora, became ill. She was hurriedly replaced by an actress not suited to the role (although this same actress turned in a fine performance later as Willy Loman's wife in Death of a Salesman). We saw Doll's House with the second actesss and found the performance off balance. Allowing for the possibility that the rest of the cast was reacting to the stronger interpretation despite its absence, or perhaps overcompensating to fill a vacuum, it still seemed that there were faulty character relationsips related to a superficial concept of the text itself--a theory difficult to support having seen only the one version. Simplifying the general impression, instead of a play about dignity, honesty, responsibility and mutual respect in marriage, it became a story of a neurotic woman who left her husband because he shouted at her. (Incidentally, the two versions of the play are discussed briefly on the tape by high school students, a few of whom had seen the first actress.)

Moliere's School for Wives was a stylish show, colorful, swift, well in keeping with the literary material. If there is any objection to this production, it duplicates an objection we have had to previous productions that the actors tend to move as if an audience might suspend attention were number of seconds to pass without the characters changing place on stage. We prefer less movement. The company did not, on the other hand, overuse broad humor as it has in the past, but tastefully adhered to script apportionments of "low" and "high" comedy.

Miller's Death of a Salesman was a fine production, one of the best we have seen in Louisville, professional or amateur. Beautifully cast, sensitively acted, movingly directed, this careful performance reflected honest artistry. Outside of minor complaints about moments of interpretation, our major objection was to the inhibition or cramping of actors' movements by the clumsy set, an evil necessitated by the limitations of the stage itself. This objection leads us to a discussion of the physical plant.

Actor's Theater is now housed in a reconstructed railroad station. The old building, overlooking the Ohio River, has a measure of atmospheric charm both in the approaches to it and in the exterior and interior, itself. The large, high-ceilinged lobby has remained. The waiting room became the theater proper. In the theater section, the primary stage takes one corner of the large, rectangular room. This corner to the audience's left is twenty-seven feet deep at best; a secondary, narrower arm of the stage running to the right corner is 18 feet deep. The audience area of 260 seats is tiered well--sight lines and acoustics are fine. This is a modified arena stage: no proscenium arch, no curtain, no opportunity for "flying" sets. Any major set alteration waits until intermission. We can imagine that the adaptation of some plays, particularly those with several scene changes within the act, might present difficult problems should the company adhere to standard sets sometimes requested by the author. For example, the Death of a Salesman set was inflexible, a good section of the major stage floor taken up by Willy's house, resulting as we have suggested, in the cramping of certain other scenes. Death of a Salesman, however, was the only play of the series in which the stage seemed limited. Often

the full 30 foot width of the stage was dressed and operative, the ingenious sets placed well back so that the stage seemed more expansive than it really is. Ingenuity can go just so far in creating space, unfortunately, and we suspect that Actor's Theater would not attempt to perform a play which required more than fifteen or twenty characters on stage at the same time.

We were disappointed in Cohan's The Tavern. We have nothing against a purely theatrical romp; but prefer that a romp be disciplined by the author's purpose. The Tavern is not an authentic antique from the American school of naive melodrama. It is a parody of this school with a modest message of its own concerning theatrical conventions which did not always lend itself to persistent broad comedy. The inventive, even inspired moments of timed visual humor became increasingly tiresome as the play's purpose became muddier. Even an unpretentious play deserves more attention than the techniques used in presenting it.

Wilder's Our Town was presented as a "bonus" outside of the regular season. Tryouts for the production were thrown open to high school students, university students and community members. Those roles which could not be filled adequately from the auditions were given to Actor's Theater acting staff. We assume the production was successful, but did not see it. Newspaper reviews were complimentary. Word of mouth from the students participating in the production reflected genuine gratitude that they had been allowed the experience. Both teachers and students who saw the production compared it favorably with others in the series.

Actor's Theater fills a definite need in the community. Local amateur or semi-professional groups may occasionally choose a play of merit and perform it at a "professional" level. Visiting professional companies vary considerably in production quality and excellence of play choice. With the exception of the yearly one week visit of the National Repertory company, there is only Actor's Theater which can guarantee the production of plays with both literary value and performance competance. Actor's Theater has not, to my knowledge, presented a truly bad show. A discerning critic may leave the theater irritated that a production has fallen short of expectation, frustrated that literary nuances had been ignored, even angry at distortions of comic

or tragic balance, but never deprived of an honest, consistent, smooth performance with a clearly defined directorial point of view. No critic can expect a better guarantee.

IV

Evaluation: Needs and Accomplishments

Since the committee does not wish to expose pupils from any particular school, and since the committee has no intention of comparing particular schools or school systems, the groups, for the purposes of this section of report, are labeled as follows:

Groups S (sustained, drama)	- Pupils saw all five plays and were enrolled in a regularly scheduled high school drama class.
Group E (limited viewing, humanities)	- Pupils saw only one play and were enrolled in a regularly scheduled high school humanities class.
Group W (limited viewing, humanities)	- same circumstances as Group E
Group C (limited viewing, poverty target area)	- Pupils saw only one play and were enrolled in regular high school English classes.
Group M (limited viewing, poverty target area)	- same as Group C
Group H (limited viewing, poverty target area)	same as Groups C and M.

It follows that two distinct categories of pupils were "treated," i.e. those who saw all five productions versus those who saw only one production. A further distinction among groups becomes clear and finds reflection within these analyses, i.e. Groups S, E and W represent pupils who were not from poverty target area schools while pupils in Groups C, M, and H were from schools withing the poverty target area. The regular school curricula followed by all pupils imposes another dichotomy between pupils i.e. pupils from classrooms that participated in other community theatrical activities. Thus, pupils in Groups S, E, and W had a commonality of experience, i.e. sustained theatrical experiences of some sort - be those experiences in attending concerts, Theater Guild performances, ballet, or lectures of a public nature.

Description of the Sample

Educational Level of Parents

The educational level of the parents of pupils participating in the evaluation sample sheds some light on the outcomes of pupil performance. The parents of pupils who were in Group S (sustaining, drama) did not represent the highest level of educational background. However, the average education was "some college work, but no degree." On the other hand, pupils from one target area, Group C (non-sustaining poverty ares), came from families whose education average was "college degree, plus some graduate work. Although Group S had the highest scores on all measures, Group C pupils were not always among the highest or second highest.

Pupils in Groups E and W (non-sustaining, humanities) came from families which had "attained secondary school diplomas, most frequently attended college for a while." Their counterparts, Groups H and M (non-sustaining, poverty) came from families which had not attained secondary school diplomas. Generally, pupils in Group E and W had better performance scores on all measures than did their counterparts in Groups H and M.

Educational Aspirations

Pupils from Groups S, W, E aspired for educations which encompassed at least a 4-year college program; however, most frequently pupils aspired to some kind of professional status requiring additional study past the baccalaureate. The counterparts in Groups C, H, and M aspired most frequently to college educations; however, those from large families (more than 2 children) tended to seek employment upon completion of high school. Family size seemingly had no part in the consideration of college education among groups which had college educated parents; whereas, formally, size did relate to educational aspiration among pupils whose parents had only secondary training, whether that training was complete or interrupted

Generally, the highest achievers held "college educations" as one of their goals. The very highest achievers held to aspiration for "professional" status.

Interestingly enough, the family size and structure played no overall part in the achievement patterns. The average family size among the target area pupils was

2.9, while average family size among the advantaged was slightly higher--3.3.

Outside Activities

Pupils in Groups S, W, and E most frequently chose outside school activities centered around reading, theater, music, art, and similarly allied configurations. Pupils in Groups H, C, and M chose most frequently activities centered about sports and home making, with several who placed "work" as their favorite outside-of-school activity. Only in Groups S did pupils mention dating as a desirable activity.

Likes & Dislikes in School

Pupils in Groups S, W, and E most frequently mentioned favorite subjects as English, Humanities, Languages, Music and Art, while they disliked most vehemently Math and Science. Pupils in Groups E, M, and H liked a variety of subjects (no pattern observed), but they disliked the same school subjects as the other groups, i.e. Math and Science.

Homework

No clear pattern of homework involvement emerged. Pupils in Groups S, W, and E averaged slightly less time on homework (12 hours per week) as opposed to Groups C, M, and H (13 hours per week)

No other personal data was analyzed.

Theater Attitudes

To test the efficacy of sustained viewing on the positive attitudinal development among various groups of junior and senior students in high school attending Actor's Theater, scores from six groups of students who responded to the Questionnaire on Drama were analyzed. Students in one of the groups attended all five performances while the students in the other five groups saw only one play. In the analysis of pupil scores no attempt was made to partial out the effects of initial pupil attributes which might have influenced the scores (intelligence, reading

ability, socio-economic class to mention a few). The analysis presented in Table I, shows that significant differences (.01 level) existed in pupil attitudes toward the theater. A contrast of means (Group S was the group which attended all five performances) indicates two findings. Differences ascertained in the analysis of variance of attitude scores might be attributable to: 1) pupils who saw five performances as opposed to those who saw only one performance (i.e. sustained viewing versus limited viewing experiences); and 2) the pupils who scored the lowest were pupils from areas which sustain the worst pockets of cultural deprivation.

Although the findings are subject to much criticism in view of the fact that initial pupil status was unaccounted for in the analysis, the evidence points out the need for controlled experimentation to ascertain 1) the amount of viewing necessary to produce the maximum development of positive attitudes toward the theater; 2) the emphasis needed to implement the curriculum, in the poverty areas which suffer the most from deprivation, to the extent that pupils may overcome the effects of each in cultural exposure. Seemingly, it is of little value to some pupils when exposure is minimal. In fact the attitudes held by pupils in the schools which are located within the pockets of cultural deprivation were only slightly positive; whereas, the attitudes held by pupils who attended one performance and who were from more advantaged areas were not significantly different from those attitudes held by pupils who saw all five plays.

The analysis does not reveal other effects which accrue to pupils who participated, e.g. understanding of the plays, the impact of the drama seen, and achievement in terms of learning of and about drama. Other analyses attempt to explore those effects.

Table I

Analysis of Variance of Pupil Raw Scores in Six Groups of High School Students on Questionnaire on Drama

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Est. Mean Square	F	$F_{.95}$	$F_{.99}$
Total	12,155	40				
Among Groups	4,360	5	872.0	3.87**	2.53	3.70
Within Groups	7,895	35	225.0			

**Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table II

Comparison of Mean Pupil Scores Among Six Groups of High School Students on Questionnaire on Drama

Group	Mean	S	C	E	W	M	H
Group S	222	-				*	*
Group C	217		-				
Group E	216			-			
Group W	211				-		
Group M	201					-	
Group H	198						-

*Significant beyond the .05 level using the Sheffé Technique for comparison of means.

Self-Esteem

Although no significant differences appeared (sig. at the .05 level) in scores on pupil ratings of self-abilities, those who had seen the five plays (as opposed to those who saw only a single performance) tended to rate themselves higher than their counterparts. Compositely, the frequent viewers saw themselves as more socially capable, more responsible for themselves and others, and more able to perform intellectual tasks in the arts and the sciences than did their counterparts.

Pupils from one school located in one of the poverty target areas saw themselves in in a much poorer light (self-esteem) than did those who came from the more culturally

advantaged areas. Hence the study (although not statistically significant) lends credence to the belief that pupil self-image may be improved through exposure to dramatic experience.

In thelight of the fact that no controlled experimentation was feasible, (note that one group of students from a target area school, Group C, had parents with the highest educational background) the committee recommends that the possibility of raising pupil self-esteem through dramatic experiences be explored.

Table III

Analysis of Variance of Pupil Raw Scores in Six Groups of High School Students on a Self-Rating Scale

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Est. Mean Square	F	$F_{.95}$
Total	14,743	40			
Among Groups	537	5	107.4	0.25(ns)	2.53
Within Groups	14,206	35	406.0		

(ns) not significant

Table IV

Pupil Mean Scores in Six Groups of High School Students on a Self-Rating Scale

Group	Mean Score
Group S	51 (highest)
Group E	52
Group C	53
Group W	54
Group M	57
Group H	58

The mean self-esteem scores for pupils indicates that on a scale going from "very good," "good," "fair," "not so good," and "poor," pupils assessed themselves as only "fair" to "good."

Listening Skills

The committee also felt that listening skills attainment might accrue more favorably to those pupils who experienced sustained viewing experiences versus those with limited viewing experiences. Measuring listening skills through the STEP-Listening, Form 2 A, the analysis of pupil raw scores appears in Table V.

Table V

Analysis of Variance of Pupil Raw Scores in Six Groups of High School Students on STEP-Listening, Test Form 2A

Source of Variance	Sum of Squares	d. f.	Est. Mean Square	F	$F_{.99}$
Total	663.0	40			
Among Groups	503.0	5	100.6	21.90**	3.70
Within Groups	160.0	35	4.6		

** Significant at or beyond the .01 level

Table VI

Comparison of Pupil Mean Scores of Six Groups of High School Students on STEP-Listening Test, Form 2A

Groups	Means	E	W	S	C	M	H
Group E	38.0	-			*	*	*
Group W	36.3		-		*	*	*
Group S	34.2			-			*
Group C	32.3				-		
Group M	31.5					-	
Group H	29.4						-

Additional Contrasts:

Advantaged Schools (E, W, S) vs. Disadvantaged Schools (C, M, H)*

*Significant beyond the .05 level using the Sheffé technique for comparing means.

Although the mean pupil score for those who experienced sustained viewing was not the highest, it is noteworthy that pupils enrolled in "humanities" classes had scores significantly (at .05 level) higher than their counterparts who were enrolled in

regular English classes. As constituted, the course of study in high school humanities calls for many experiences in listening to recordings of music, poetry, literature, as well as attendance at an opera, concerts, and plays other than those produced by Actors Theater.

A question naturally arises about the improvement of curriculum in schools and classes where these advantages do not prevail and where the typical classroom structure is built around "lesson giving." Another question arises about the effects which accrue to children who are denied such experiences, no matter what the economic condition is. That is to say, there appears reason to believe that "deprivation" is not always a matter of social and economic class. Still another question arises about the effects among deprived pupils which may accrue to extended experiences in viewing and participating in the theater.

Achievement Tests

The evaluation committee was also interested in the amount of understanding pupils gained in specific content derived from each of the five plays. Members of the committee constructed several short-answer, multiple-choice and essay tests for use in assessing pupil achievement in literary content and knowledge about the plays. A sample copy is attached to this report.

Pupils from two different categories took the tests as administered by their teachers. Category 1 consisted of pupils who saw all five plays, and Category 2 consisted of pupils who saw only one play. Category 2 pupils were from both advantaged area schools as well as disadvantaged area schools. Admittedly, the results in pupil performance were not uniform due to several factors, among which we point out two of the more critical ones: 1) the sporadic circulation of the tests caused by lack of funds for distributing the instruments save *via* the committee's own transportation and the fact that someone was "going to a particular school," and 2) the allocation of appropriate test-taking time which did not interfere with other classroom activities.

Nevertheless, the tests were administered to 1) a group of students who saw all five plays and 2) their counterparts who saw only a single production. Comparisons of mean pupil performance on the tests revealed no significant differences in the five sets of means. The same outcomes were observable as found in the results from the other tests, i.e. attitudes, self-esteem, and listening skills. Pupils who saw all the plays tended to remember more and demonstrate better insights into the play's message and literary content than did their counterparts who saw only one play. Pupils from advantaged-area schools made higher scores (though not significantly higher) than did the pupils from the more disadvantaged area schools.

V

Review of Recommendations

The evaluating committee has made numerous suggestions throughout this report aimed toward improvement of the program. It was inevitable, as we worked severally and together on different aspects, that certain deficiencies assumed more importance than others. What we consider a valuable experiment is nonetheless an initial experiment in this area, ready for extension and progress. Following are the recommendations the committee considers most important, presented in the order in which they appear in the evaluation.

1. The committee recommends that the local administration of the program pursue all reasonable means toward bringing dramatic experience and classroom experience more closely together. Specifically, the committee recommends expenditure of effort and funds, if possible, to assure that every teacher whose students see Actor's Theater productions be encouraged to see the work also. In addition the committee recommends that tape recordings of parts of plays and discussions of interpretive questions be made available for classroom use.

2. The committee recommends that public relations be improved to make a positive value of distribution of tickets to students from both advantaged and disadvantaged homes.

3. The committee recommends that both Actor's Theater and the participating school systems need to come to some more expeditious plan for the distribution of tickets, perhaps direct supply from the printing firm to the several boards of education, or direct shipment to responsible persons within the schools.

4. The committee recommends a better planned and more highly controlled student learning experience. This would encompass discussion of and depth study in play production staging and management, and a sound reading and depth study of the play and its author including appreciation of time, social condition and literary merit. Also involved would be an understanding of peripheral values such as participation as a part of an audience, the adjunct vocational employment in the theater setting, and the expected role of young adults among mature and serious theater goers.

5. The committee does not deny that the living theater serves a function of "entertainment;" however, we must recommend that educators realize the broader responsibility, purpose and function which the theater must meet. That is, simply, to make social comment on the problems and issues we face because we need to seek solutions to those problems and issues.

6. In addition to the distribution of study guides, the committee feels that administrators responsible for the program ought to see that school libraries have at least two copies of each play available for teacher use and several copies of the plays availablo fcr pupil use.

7. The committee feels that road safety and traffic jams can not be ignored. If either students furnish their own transportation or school buses transport children, the committee wonders if allowing for only twenty minutes between school dismissal and matinee "curtain" time does not encourage unsafe driving practices. Actor's Theater personnel should consider carefully any professional (union rules and requirements included) objections to delay in "curtain time" and adjust evening performances accordingly.

8. With respect to some contentions that Actor's Theater consider two separate series (even if some overlap occurs) for students and public, the committee strongly suggests that the matter be delayed or shelved.

9. The committee recommends, since no controlled experimentation was feasible, that the possibility of raising pupil self-esteem through dramatic experiences be explored both in the advantaged and disadvantaged groups.

10. The committee recommends that the Study Guide committee for 1966-67 make all possible efforts to assure that the Guides are unexceptionable in points of grammar and syntax and that some vital critical points in the individual plays be treated specifically enough so the teacher unfamiliar with a particular epoch of drama or a particular dramatist's work be guided into consideration of the major issues.

11. The committee recommends increased communication between those responsible for the Study Guides and the classroom teachers, specifically that forms for teacher-criticism be attached to teacher copies of the Guide. In this way the teachers' needs

and desires developed while working with these teaching aids can contribute valuable insights to those working toward improving the guides.

JUN 25 1967